

Dishonesty replies to the demands of Want, "Certainly, but tomorrow."

Bribery answers blind, long suffering justice, "Oh, yes, tomorrow."

And so Iniquity to Righteousness, Hate to Love; Doubt to Faith, and so on thru the whole iniquitous family. The one birth-mark always evident is "Tomorrow."

Now all this is distressing and demoralizing in the natural man and the present evil world, but it becomes ten-fold more so when it occurs in the man born of God, and seeing and living in spiritual things—a new heaven and a new earth. Just think of it; the Master *praying and commanding* laborers to his vineyard *today*, and they replying, "We go, Master, tomorrow."

The Christian, of all others, should plan as if he were to live *here* forever, and yet work as if *today* were his last. May each who reads this resolve that what *may* be done *today* shall not be deferred until "tomorrow." Forgive that injury today; speak that kind word today; be reconciled to God today; have the life more abundant today; give to that good cause today, for TODAY is the day of salvation, and NOW is the accepted time.

THE LORD'S SUPPER

G. W. RENCH

Was it the Jewish Passover? In my last article I tried to show that the practice of the early church is conclusive evidence that the Lord's Supper was not the Passover. If the last supper of our Lord was the Jews' Passover then the Apostolic church kept the Passover and that under the direction of inspired men.

My next argument is that the Passover night had not yet come when Jesus ate his supper. The Passover was instituted to bring to the mind of the Jew a certain time—a certain night—the night when they were delivered from the bondage of slavery. It was also to point to a time when a sacrifice was to be made to deliver the people from a worse bondage than slavery, that of sin. If scripture language means anything *time* is one of the essential elements of the Passover. Ex. 12:14, says, "And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord thru-out your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever,"

"This day," you see, not any day. Many more passages could be given but going to the New Testament, Mark 14:12, we have, "And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, his disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare that thou mayest eat the passover?" At this time we see that a *certain time* was yet recognized for killing the passover; as the lamb was sometimes called. Num. 9:2, says "Let the children of Israel

also keep the Passover in his appointed season. In the fourteenth day of this month, at even, ye shall keep it in his appointed season." It is very evident to all who have read of the institution of this memorial in the scriptures that the passover, or lamb, was to be killed at the going down of the sun and eaten later on in the evening or night. Ex. 12. But since sunset marked the division between the days as midnight does now, the lamb was killed on one day but eaten the next. *When was the time to kill the lamb?* Settle this question and you have the key to the whole situation. Dillon in his debate with Bashor said that the scriptures say that the lamb was to be kept up until the fourteenth day of the month; but "until the fourteenth" did not mean *into* the fourteenth, and the lamb therefore was killed on the thirteenth. Gibson, while he was a Dunkard refuted this position, as their debater, but since he has become a Campbellite accepts this position that the lamb was killed on the thirteenth. Why do they want to believe this? Because if the lamb was killed on the thirteenth, it was of course eaten the beginning of the fourteenth, and since Christ ate his Supper on the fourteenth that would make Christ's Supper and the Passover come together in the point of time and the conclusion would be easily reached that the Last Supper was the Passover.

But it matters little to me what Dillon or Gibson say. What does God say? II Chron. 30:15. "Then they killed the passover on the fourteenth day of the second month." II Chron. 35, "Moreover Josiah kept a passover unto the Lord in Jerusalem: and they killed the passover on the fourteenth day of the first month." When Gibson, in the *Christian Standard*, was quoting nearly everything that came in his mind to prove that the lamb was killed on the thirteenth, why did he evade these two verses? If he were after truth as he would make believe, why did he, or why does any honest man act that way? These two verses would have saved a column of nonsensical reading matter and would have upset a theory to uphold a false position. But truth will prevail.

If the lamb was to be slain at the going down of the sun, as the scriptures declare, and it was killed on the fourteenth day of the month as the scriptures declare, and then eaten in the early part of the night of the fifteenth as must follow, my proposition *that the Passover night had not yet come when Jesus ate his supper* is established, for Jesus ate his supper on the first day of unleavened bread when they killed the passover. Luke 7:1.

Now, dear reader, you have another fact that will help you to understand Matthew, Mark, Luke and John when you read about the Passover. You ask, "might they not change the time for

killing the lamb?" But Mark and Luke both say that Peter and John were sent on the day when the passover must be killed to search out their place. So you can't talk "change" on this point. My first two arguments being established, the others to follow will be easier and more conclusive.

THE ENTERING IN OF THE WEDGE

V. M. REICHARD

When the storm of disruption broke upon the Dunkard fraternity in the early eighties, breaking it into three distinct and separate organizations, to the "Progressive" element, officially known as the Brethren, was given the custody of that most precious of boons, "the gospel alone" practice with strictly congregational local self government. For fifteen years pulpits resounded with its echo and our press strenuously insisted on these things as our distinguishing characteristics and the reason par excellence for our existence as a distinct organization.

Some of us had begun to look upon these things as vital and fundamental and felt that their abandonment would have been a tacit admission of failure and equivalent to saying in so many words that those who came out from the German Baptist church were following a chimera—an impossible *ignis fatuus*. This is the way we were taught, this is what we believed and it was the ruling of all distinct and national councils up to the assembling of Virginia, Maryland and West Virginia conference which lately met at Reliance, Virginia. This conference in its cumulative wisdom and experience has decided by a unanimous vote that we are not congregational and that the conference has powers which heretofore resided solely in the congregation. I refer to the resolution which was introduced by Eld. E. B. Shaver, declaring that no member of the Brethren church of this conference district should be ordained to the ministry until a committee representing the conference should have examined and passed upon such member. More violent, revolutionary and irrational legislation has never been passed in this conference district and I for one cannot leave it pass unchallenged nor without making a positive protest.

What powers has any conference inherent in itself? What representative body can rise higher than its source and arrogate to itself undelegated authority? It may be said that any representative body may pass upon the qualifications of its members. This argument is specious and misleading. The highest representative body in the United States is the House of Representatives. The members come from various states with their credentials certified by the proper state officers.